

## PATENT

## REMARKS

Claims 1-30 are pending in the present application, of which claims 1, 12, 22, 25, 27 and 29 are independent. Applicants believe that the present application is in condition for allowance, which prompt and favorable action is respectfully requested.

*Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103*

Claims 1-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Terane (US 5,905,813) in view of Li et al (US 6,094,631).

Section 706.02(j) provides that, in order to establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the reference or to combine the reference teaching. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Section 706.02(j), further provides that, "To support the conclusion that the claimed invention is directed to obvious subject matter, either the references must expressly or impliedly suggest the claimed invention or the examiner must present a convincing line of reasoning as to why the artisan would have found the claimed invention to have been obvious in light of the teachings of the references."

The Examiner provides that Terane reference in view of the Li reference is unpatentable. Examiner provides the same argument to reject all the independent claims as well as all the dependent claims. Since, there are 6 independent claims (1, 12, 22, 25, 27 and 29), each with different scope, it is difficult to determine to which claim the Examiner is using the support of the reference to reject the claims. Thus, the examiner has not provided convincing line of reasoning as to why the artisan of each claim would have found the claimed invention to have been obvious in light of the teaching of the reference. Also, it is difficult the applicant to provide a proper amendments when same basis of rejection used for all the claims wherein not all the discussed elements (or the equalilents) are not in each claim of the current application (for example claims 1 and 27). Therefore, the applicant respectfully requests a non-final office action with clarification or an allowance of the claims.


**PATENT**

**REQUEST FOR ALLOWANCE**

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that all pending claims in the application are patentable. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of this application are earnestly solicited. Should any issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 2, 2005

By:   
Milan Patel, Reg. No. 41,242  
858-651-6892

QUALCOMM Incorporated  
5775 Morehouse Drive  
San Diego, California 92121  
Telephone: (858) 658-5787  
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502